

means for supplying a vacuum in the area of the second drainage strips;

3
B the twin wire zone having a third section following the second section along the path of the wire belts through the twin wire zone; a second drainage element in the third section, for being engaged by one of the wire belts as the wire belts travel over the second drainage element, the second drainage element having an open surface to enable water to be drained through the wire belt in contact therewith;

the twin wire zone being free of solid rolls which deflect the twin wire zone and which cause a table roll effect.--

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully appreciate the allowability of claims 5, 6, 29 and 30.

Claims 5, 6, 29 and 30 have been amended to address the Examiner's rejection thereof under 35 U.S.C. §112 and, in the case of claims 5 and 6, to place these claims in independent form. With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 concerning lines 33 and 36 of claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that the present language is clear. Since it does not matter whether the most upstream one of the drainage strips is a first drainage strip or a second drainage strip, the interpretation given to the language by the Examiner is correct and is the intended meaning.

Claims 1-4, 7-28 and 31 have been cancelled and claims 32 and 33 have been added to more adequately protect applicants' invention.

With respect to the double patenting rejection, although applicants do not agree that this is well taken, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, applicants are enclosing herewith Terminal Disclaimers, one relating to U.S. Patent No. 5,389,206 and the other relating to U.S. Patent No. 5,500,091. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-31 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting be withdrawn.

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over WO91/02842 or 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over WO '842 in view of Halme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,994,774). Claims 5, 6, 29 and 30 have been amended to delete the phrase "of a substantial length". Accordingly, WO '842 is not available as prior art against claims 5, 6, 29 and 30. Applicants, therefore, request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 6, 29 and 30 on this ground.

Claims 1-4, 7-28 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tissari or Koski in view of DE '133, further in view of Nyman or WO 86/04368 or Nevalainen et al. All of these claims have been cancelled. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot.

With respect to new claims 32 and 33, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable for the same reasons as claims 5, 6, 29 and 30. More specifically, claim 32 specifies that the twin wire zone is free of guide rolls which deflect the twin wire zone and which causes a table roll affect. Support for this limitation may be found on page 5, lines 32 to page 6.

With respect to claim 33 this is the same as claim 32 except "guide rolls" have been changed to "solid rolls". It is believed that this language is supported by the disclosure of a guide roll which, as is well known, has a smooth surface as compared to other rolls, such as forming rolls or suction rolls whose surfaces are generally perforated. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of the single species of a guide roll is sufficient support for applicants claim of a solid roll in claim 33. In this connection see MPEP §2164.03 which states:

A single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements. In re Vickers, 141 F.2d 522, 61 USPQ 122 (CCPA 1944); In re Cook, 439 F.2d 730, 169 USPQ 298 (CCPA 1971).

Vickers was also cited as support for a predecessor of Section 2164.03 which stated that: "In mechanical cases, broad claims may properly be supported by a single form of an apparatus or structure". See In re Cook, supra at p. 301. Both Vickers and Cook further hold that the basis for this proposition is that in mechanical cases it is obvious from the disclosure of one species that other species will work, whereas the same is not true in non-predictable arts, such as chemical cases.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on March 4, 1997:

Martin Pfeffer

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

March 4, 1997

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Pfeffer

Registration No.: 20,808

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MP:rdj:arr
Enclosures